

ATTACHMENT 5

BST - MIGRATION REJECTS

LLIMS GUI DATA	
VERSIONS SENT	26829
REJECTS	7453
REJECT RATE	27.8%
INITIAL REJECT VOLUME	59.4%
RE-REJECT VOLUME	40.6%
METIS DATA	
INITIAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
SUPPLEMENTAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
OVERALL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!

REJECTS BY ORDER TYPE		
MIGRATION	7875	100.0%
NEW INSTALL	0	
CHANGE	0	
MOVE	0	
RECORD	0	
SUSPEND	0	
RESTORE	0	
DEACTIVATION	0	
TOTAL	7875	100%

September

RE-REJECT ANALYSIS		
INITIAL	59.4%	4676
2X	31.9%	2513
3X OR >	8.7%	686
TOTAL	100%	7875

TOP ISSUES	ALL REJECTS			INITIAL			SUPPLEMENTAL		
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
1 MULTIPLE BTN	2094	27%	7.4%	1369	17.4%	4.8%	725	9.2%	2.6%
2 NAME/ADDRESS	1637	21%	5.8%	1165	14.8%	4.1%	472	6.0%	1.7%
3 PONVERSION REJECTS	861	11%	3.0%	15	0.2%	0.1%	846	10.8%	3.0%
4 LCON	673	9%	2.4%	660	8.4%	2.3%	13	0.2%	0.0%
5 PON AGED OFF	598	8%	2.1%	4	0.1%	0.0%	594	7.6%	2.1%
6 MIGRATION DECLINED	336	4%	1.2%	327	4.2%	1.2%	9	0.1%	0.0%
7 FEATURES/USOCS	298	4%	1.1%	191	2.4%	0.7%	107	1.4%	0.4%
8 INVALID TN	198	3%	0.7%	114	1.5%	0.4%	84	1.1%	0.3%
9 REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	175	2%	0.6%	100	1.3%	0.4%	75	1.0%	0.3%
10 LOCAL FREEZE	160	2%	0.6%	157	2.0%	0.6%	3	0.0%	0.0%

TOP 5 OF INITIAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
MULTIPLE BTN	1369	17%	4.8%
NAME/ADDRESS	1165	15%	4.1%
LCON	660	8%	2.3%
MIGRATION DECLINED	327	4%	1.2%
FEATURES/USOCS	191	2%	0.7%

TOP 5 OF SUPPLEMENTAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
PONVERSION REJECTS	846	11%	3.0%
MULTIPLE BTN	725	9%	2.6%
PON AGED OFF	594	8%	2.1%
NAME/ADDRESS	472	6%	1.7%
FEATURES/USOCS	107	1%	0.4%

TOP REJECT CODES

G9496 - TNS=7704753071 ON LNUM=00002 NOT FOUND ON EATN=7704753071 FOR ACT=	26%	2024
MCI CODE [Z23] name/address	12%	916
R1030 - VER MUST BE GREATER THAN PREVIOUS VERSION	10%	793
E2120 - LCON-NAME MUST BE UP TO 15 ALPHANUMERICS WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS AT MAIN LOCATION	8%	662
R1645 - LSR/PON AGED OFF	8%	598
G7250 - LSR HOUSENUMBER INCORRECT	4%	307
G9626 - CLASS OF SERVICE LNPRL NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONVERSION TO PORT/LOOP SERVICE	4%	301
G7905 - RSAG - INCORRECT COMMUNITY, INCORRECT ZIP CODE OR INVALID ADDRESS FORMAT	3%	256
ALL REMAINING UNKNOWNNS	2%	175
G9860 - UNABLE TO HANDLE REQUEST; ENDUSER ACCOUNT FROZEN	2%	159
MCI CODE [Z10] invalid or insufficient reject detail	2%	119
MCI CODE [Z12] pending order	1%	108
G8209 - USOC COMBINATION IS INVALID. FORMAT SAE 587 I1 ESXDC /TN 770 532-2155	1%	96
G8830 - CLEC ALREADY OWNS THIS ACCOUNT	1%	94
MCI CODE [Z28] feature detail conflicts	1%	93
G9685 - DUE DATE COULD NOT BE CALCULATED	1%	81
G7055 - NUM=7703939880 TELNO=7703939880 ACCOUNT IS FINAL	1%	73
G9627 - ALL CUSTOMER RECORDS ARE FINAL FOR THIS NUMBER	1%	66
AO ASSIGNABLE ORDER	1%	63
G8945 - LINECLSSVC AND TOS DO NOT MATCH	1%	62

BST - ALL REJECTS

LLIMS GUI DATA	
VERSIONS SENT	36867
REJECTS	10865
REJECT RATE	29.5%
INITIAL REJECT VOLUME	62.8%
RE-REJECT VOLUME	37.2%
METIS DATA	
INITIAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
SUPPLEMENTAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
OVERALL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!

REJECTS BY ORDER TYPE		
MIGRATION	7875	64.6%
NEW INSTALL	1698	13.9%
CHANGE	1893	15.5%
MOVE	198	1.6%
RECORD	62	0.5%
SUSPEND	165	1.4%
RESTORE	5	0.0%
DEACTIVATION	298	2.4%
TOTAL	12194	100%

September

RE-REJECT ANALYSIS		
INITIAL	62.8%	7652
2X	27.8%	3387
3X OR >	9.5%	1155
TOTAL	100%	12194

TOP ISSUES	ALL REJECTS			INITIAL			SUPPLEMENTAL		
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
1 NAME/ADDRESS	2752	23%	6.8%	1846	15.6%	4.6%	906	7.7%	2.3%
2 MULTIPLE BTN	2097	18%	5.2%	1371	11.6%	3.4%	726	6.1%	1.8%
3 PONVERSION REJECTS	1172	10%	2.9%	63	0.5%	0.2%	1109	9.4%	2.8%
4 INVALID TN	819	7%	2.0%	654	5.5%	1.6%	165	1.4%	0.4%
5 PON AGED OFF	761	6%	1.9%	4	0.0%	0.0%	757	6.4%	1.9%
6 LCON	699	6%	1.7%	686	5.8%	1.7%	13	0.1%	0.0%
7 LISTING REJECTS	566	5%	1.4%	500	4.2%	1.2%	66	0.6%	0.2%
8 FEATURES/USOCS	449	4%	1.1%	277	2.3%	0.7%	172	1.5%	0.4%
9 BST REJECTS	398	3%	1.0%	264	2.2%	0.7%	134	1.1%	0.3%
10 MIGRATION DECLINED	342	3%	0.9%	330	2.8%	0.8%	12	0.1%	0.0%

TOP 5 OF INITIAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
NAME/ADDRESS	1846	16%	4.6%
MULTIPLE BTN	1371	12%	3.4%
LCON	686	6%	1.7%
INVALID TN	654	6%	1.6%
LISTING REJECTS	500	4%	1.2%

TOP 5 OF SUPPLEMENTAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
PONVERSION REJECTS	1109	9%	2.8%
NAME/ADDRESS	906	8%	2.3%
PON AGED OFF	757	6%	1.9%
MULTIPLE BTN	726	6%	1.8%
FEATURES/USOCS	172	1%	0.4%

TOP REJECT CODES

G9496 - TNS=7704753071 ON LNUM=00002 NOT FOUND ON EATN=7704753071 FOR ACT=	17%	2025
MCI CODE [Z23] name/address	11%	1316
R1030 - VER MUST BE GREATER THAN PREVIOUS VERSION	8%	1036
G7905 - RSAG - INCORRECT COMMUNITY, INCORRECT ZIP CODE OR INVALID ADDRESS FORMAT	7%	879
R1645 - LSR/PON AGED OFF	6%	761
E2120 - LCON-NAME MUST BE UP TO 15 ALPHANUMERICS WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS AT MAIN LOCATION	6%	688
D4045 - DLNUM=&DLNM LTN=<N ASSOCIATED LACT COMBINATION I OR O MISSING	3%	354
D4065 - DLNUM=&DLNM LTN=<N ASSOCIATED LACT COMBINATION I AND O IS MISSING	3%	354
AO ASSIGNABLE ORDER	3%	337
G7400 - CLEC DOES NOT OWN THIS ACCOUNT.	3%	309
G7250 - LSR HOUSENUMBER INCORRECT	3%	307
G9626 - CLASS OF SERVICE LNPRL NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONVERSION TO PORT/LOOP SERVICE	2%	301
ALL REMAINING UNKNOWNNS	2%	293
G9627 - ALL CUSTOMER RECORDS ARE FINAL FOR THIS NUMBER	2%	243
G9442 - DLNUM=0001 LTN=7709961213 ALI MUST BE UNIQUE	1%	170
G9860 - UNABLE TO HANDLE REQUEST; ENDUSER ACCOUNT FROZEN	1%	159
MCI CODE [Z12] pending order	1%	159
MCI CODE [Z28] feature detail conflicts	1%	135
G7055 - NUM=7703939880 TELNO=7703939880 ACCOUNT IS FINAL	1%	130
MCI CODE [Z10] invalid or insufficient reject detail	1%	130

BST - MIGRATION REJECTS

LLIMS GUI DATA	
VERSIONS SENT	32088
REJECTS	8394
REJECT RATE	26.2%
INITIAL REJECT VOLUME	63.9%
RE-REJECT VOLUME	36.1%
METIS DATA	
INITIAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
SUPPLEMENTAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
OVERALL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!

REJECTS BY ORDER TYPE		
MIGRATION	9165	100%
NEW INSTALL	0	
CHANGE	0	
MOVE	0	
RECORD	0	
SUSPEND	0	
RESTORE	0	
DEACTIVATION	0	
TOTAL	9165	100%

August

RE-REJECT ANALYSIS		
INITIAL	63.9%	5860
2X	34.8%	3189
3X OR >	1.3%	116
TOTAL	100%	9165

TOP ISSUES	ALL REJECTS			INITIAL			SUPPLEMENTAL		
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
1 PON AGED OFF	2471	27%	7.1%	26	0.3%	0.1%	2445	26.7%	7.0%
2 MULTIPLE BTN	2160	24%	6.2%	1944	21.2%	5.5%	216	2.4%	0.6%
3 NAME/ADDRESS	1747	19%	5.0%	1610	17.6%	4.6%	137	1.5%	0.4%
4 LCON	484	5%	1.4%	479	5.2%	1.4%	5	0.1%	0.0%
5 MIGRATION DECLINED	433	5%	1.2%	425	4.6%	1.2%	8	0.1%	0.0%
6 PONVERSION REJECTS	393	4%	1.1%	128	1.4%	0.4%	265	2.9%	0.8%
7 FEATURES/USOCS	326	4%	0.9%	276	3.0%	0.8%	50	0.5%	0.1%
8 REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	202	2%	0.6%	155	1.7%	0.4%	47	0.5%	0.1%
9 LOCAL FREEZE	184	2%	0.5%	179	2.0%	0.5%	5	0.1%	0.0%
10 PENDING ORDER	179	2%	0.5%	149	1.6%	0.4%	30	0.3%	0.1%

TOP 5 OF INITIAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
MULTIPLE BTN	1944	21%	5.5%
NAME/ADDRESS	1610	18%	4.6%
LCON	479	5%	1.4%
MIGRATION DECLINED	425	5%	1.2%
FEATURES/USOCS	276	3%	0.8%

TOP 5 OF SUPPLEMENTAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
PON AGED OFF	2445	27%	7.0%
PONVERSION REJECTS	265	3%	0.8%
MULTIPLE BTN	216	2%	0.6%
NAME/ADDRESS	137	1%	0.4%
FEATURES/USOCS	50	1%	0.1%

TOP REJECT CODES

R1645 - LSR/PON AGED OFF	27%	2471
G9496 - TNS=7704753071 ON LNUM=00002 NOT FOUND ON EATN=7704753071 FOR ACT=	23%	2124
MCI CODE [Z23] name/address	12%	1141
E2120 - LCON-NAME MUST BE UP TO 15 ALPHANUMERICS WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS AT MAIN LOCATION	5%	484
G9626 - CLASS OF SERVICE LNPRL NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONVERSION TO PORT/LOOP SERVICE	4%	402
G7250 - LSR HOUSENUMBER INCORRECT	3%	293
G7905 - RSAG - INCORRECT COMMUNITY, INCORRECT ZIP CODE OR INVALID ADDRESS FORMAT	2%	191
G9860 - UNABLE TO HANDLE REQUEST; ENDUSER ACCOUNT FROZEN	2%	184
R1030 - VER MUST BE GREATER THAN PREVIOUS VERSION	2%	172
MCI CODE [Z12] pending order	1%	118
G8209 - USOC COMBINATION IS INVALID. FORMAT SAE 587 I1 ESXDC /TN 770 532-2155	1%	105
R1015 - PON DUPLICATE ON INITIAL LSR	1%	88
MCI CODE [Z29] feature combination invalid	1%	88
G8195 - CALL FORWARDING USOC MUST NOT APPEAR. FORMAT SAE 540 I1 GCJ /TN 770 227-1838 /CFND 404 862-4825	1%	71
PD PENDING ORDER	1%	61
G8945 - LINECLSSVC AND TOS DO NOT MATCH	1%	60
MCI CODE [Z14] supplement invalid	1%	51
MCI CODE [Z22] due date	1%	51
MCI CODE [Z33] conflict with order activity	1%	50
MCI CODE [Z28] feature detail conflicts	1%	49

BST - ALL REJECTS

LIMS GUI DATA	
VERSIONS SENT	38712
REJECTS	10080
REJECT RATE	26.0%
INITIAL REJECT VOLUME	65.9%
RE-REJECT VOLUME	34.1%
METIS DATA	
INITIAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
SUPPLEMENTAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
OVERALL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!

REJECTS BY ORDER TYPE		
MIGRATION	9165	81%
NEW INSTALL	868	8%
CHANGE	1044	9%
MOVE	96	1%
RECORD	39	0%
SUSPEND	34	0%
RESTORE	4	0%
DEACTIVATION	77	1%
TOTAL	11327	100%

August

RE-REJECT ANALYSIS		
INITIAL	65.9%	7467
2X	32.6%	3688
3X OR >	1.5%	172
TOTAL	100%	11327

TOP ISSUES	ALL REJECTS			INITIAL			SUPPLEMENTAL		
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
1 PON AGED OFF	2746	24%	6.3%	33	0.3%	0.1%	2713	24.0%	6.2%
2 NAME/ADDRESS	2349	21%	5.4%	2136	18.9%	4.9%	213	1.9%	0.5%
3 MULTIPLE BTN	2160	19%	5.0%	1944	17.2%	4.5%	216	1.9%	0.5%
4 PONVERSION REJECTS	519	5%	1.2%	190	1.7%	0.4%	329	2.9%	0.8%
5 LCON	492	4%	1.1%	487	4.3%	1.1%	5	0.0%	0.0%
6 MIGRATION DECLINED	437	4%	1.0%	428	3.8%	1.0%	9	0.1%	0.0%
7 INVALID TN	409	4%	0.9%	380	3.4%	0.9%	29	0.3%	0.1%
8 FEATURES/USOCS	409	4%	0.9%	333	2.9%	0.8%	76	0.7%	0.2%
9 LISTING REJECTS	360	3%	0.8%	349	3.1%	0.8%	11	0.1%	0.0%
10 REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	284	3%	0.7%	214	1.9%	0.5%	70	0.6%	0.2%

TOP 5 OF INITIAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
NAME/ADDRESS	2136	19%	4.9%
MULTIPLE BTN	1944	17%	4.5%
LCON	487	4%	1.1%
MIGRATION DECLINED	428	4%	1.0%
INVALID TN	380	3%	0.9%

TOP 5 OF SUPPLEMENTAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
PON AGED OFF	2713	24%	6.2%
PONVERSION REJECTS	329	3%	0.8%
MULTIPLE BTN	216	2%	0.5%
NAME/ADDRESS	213	2%	0.5%
FEATURES/USOCS	76	1%	0.2%

TOP REJECT CODES

R1645 - LSR/PON AGED OFF	24%	2746
G9496 - TNS=7704753071 ON LNUM=00002 NOT FOUND ON EATN=7704753071 FOR ACT=	19%	2124
MCI CODE [Z23] name/address	11%	1299
G7905 - RSAG - INCORRECT COMMUNITY, INCORRECT ZIP CODE OR INVALID ADDRESS FORMAT	5%	578
E2120 - LCON-NAME MUST BE UP TO 15 ALPHANUMERICS WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS AT MAIN LOCATION	4%	492
G9626 - CLASS OF SERVICE LNPR NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONVERSION TO PORT/LOOP SERVICE	4%	402
G7250 - LSR HOUSENUMBER INCORRECT	3%	293
R1030 - VER MUST BE GREATER THAN PREVIOUS VERSION	2%	205
G9860 - UNABLE TO HANDLE REQUEST; ENDUSER ACCOUNT FROZEN	2%	184
D4045 - DLNUM=&DLNM LTN=<N ASSOCIATED LACT COMBINATION I OR O MISSING	1%	159
D4065 - DLNUM=&DLNM LTN=<N ASSOCIATED LACT COMBINATION I AND O IS MISSING	1%	159
MCI CODE [Z12] pending order	1%	153
G7400 - CLEC DOES NOT OWN THIS ACCOUNT.	1%	131
AO ASSIGNABLE ORDER	1%	130
G7055 - NUM=7703939880 TELNO=7703939880 ACCOUNT IS FINAL	1%	119
R1015 - PON DUPLICATE ON INITIAL LSR	1%	112
G8209 - USOC COMBINATION IS INVALID. FORMAT SAE 587 I1 ESXDC /TN 770 532-2155	1%	110
G9627 - ALL CUSTOMER RECORDS ARE FINAL FOR THIS NUMBER	1%	103
MCI CODE [Z29] feature combination invalid	1%	95
G8195 - CALL FORWARDING USOC MUST NOT APPEAR. FORMAT SAE 540 I1 GCJ /TN 770 227-1838 /CFND 404 862-4825	1%	71

BST - MIGRATION REJECTS

LLIMS GUI DATA	
VERSIONS SENT	28819
REJECTS	8144
REJECT RATE	28.3%
INITIAL REJECT VOLUME	75.8%
RE-REJECT VOLUME	24.2%
METIS DATA	
INITIAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
SUPPLEMENTAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
OVERALL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!

REJECTS BY ORDER TYPE		
MIGRATION	9094	100%
NEW INSTALL	0	
CHANGE	0	
MOVE	0	
RECORD	0	
SUSPEND	0	
RESTORE	0	
DEACTIVATION	0	
TOTAL	9094	100%

JULY

RE-REJECT ANALYSIS		
INITIAL	75.8%	6892
2X	22.1%	2014
3X OR >	2.1%	188
TOTAL	100%	9094

TOP ISSUES	ALL REJECTS			INITIAL			SUPPLEMENTAL		
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
1 NAME/ADDRESS	2544	28%	7.9%	2446	26.9%	7.6%	98	1.1%	0.3%
2 PON AGED OFF	1747	19%	5.4%	39	0.4%	0.1%	1708	18.8%	5.3%
3 MULTIPLE BTN	1542	17%	4.8%	1513	16.6%	4.7%	29	0.3%	0.1%
4 CLASS OF SERVICE (CID)	634	7%	2.0%	600	6.6%	1.9%	34	0.4%	0.1%
5 MIGRATION DECLINED	454	5%	1.4%	435	4.8%	1.4%	19	0.2%	0.1%
6 PON/VERSION REJECTS	368	4%	1.1%	314	3.5%	1.0%	54	0.6%	0.2%
7 LCON	338	4%	1.1%	336	3.7%	1.0%	2	0.0%	0.0%
8 FEATURES/USOCS	314	3%	1.0%	221	2.4%	0.7%	93	1.0%	0.3%
9 REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	271	3%	0.8%	213	2.3%	0.7%	58	0.6%	0.2%
10 LOCAL FREEZE	167	2%	0.5%	146	1.6%	0.5%	21	0.2%	0.1%

TOP 5 OF INITIAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
NAME/ADDRESS	2446	27%	7.6%
MULTIPLE BTN	1513	17%	4.7%
CLASS OF SERVICE (CID)	600	7%	1.9%
MIGRATION DECLINED	435	5%	1.4%
LCON	336	4%	1.0%

TOP 5 OF SUPPLEMENTAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
PON AGED OFF	1708	18%	5.3%
NAME/ADDRESS	98	1%	0.3%
FEATURES/USOCS	93	1%	0.3%
REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	58	1%	0.2%
PON/VERSION REJECTS	54	1%	0.2%

TOP REJECT CODES

WCOM[Z23] name/address	20%	1831
R1645 - LSR/PON AGED OFF	19%	1747
G9496 - TNS=7704753071 ON LNUM=00002 NOT FOUND ON EATN=7704753071 FOR ACT=	17%	1517
WCOM[Z17] class of service	6%	580
G9626 - CLASS OF SERVICE LNPRL NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONVERSION TO PORT/LOOP SERVICE	4%	402
G7250 - LSR HOUSENUMBER INCORRECT	4%	390
E2120 - LCON-NAME MUST BE UP TO 15 ALPHANUMERICS WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS AT MAIN LOCATION	4%	338
G8209 - USOC COMBINATION IS INVALID. FORMAT SAE 587 I1 ESXDC /TN 770 532-2155	3%	242
G7905 - RSAG - INCORRECT COMMUNITY, INCORRECT ZIP CODE OR INVALID ADDRESS FORMAT	2%	217
R1015 - PON DUPLICATE ON INITIAL LSR	2%	210
G9860 - UNABLE TO HANDLE REQUEST; ENDUSER ACCOUNT FROZEN	2%	167
R1110 - D/TSent MUST BE CURRENT DATE, OR A FUTURE DATE	2%	150
WCOM[Z10] invalid or insufficient reject detail	1%	75
WCOM[Z18] supplement invalid	1%	72
PD PENDING ORDER	1%	69
WCOM[Z12] pending order	1%	66
G8945 - LINECLSSVC AND TOS DO NOT MATCH	1%	54
G8825 - ORDER ERR:	1%	52
WCOM[Z21] business, DSL, special line	1%	47
G8820 - SOCS ERROR:	0%	40

BST - ALL REJECTS

LLIMS GUI DATA	
VERSIONS SENT	34643
REJECTS	9425
REJECT RATE	27.2%
INITIAL REJECT VOLUME	77.1%
RE-REJECT VOLUME	22.9%
METIS DATA	
INITIAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
SUPPLEMENTAL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!
OVERALL REJECT RATE	#DIV/0!

REJECTS BY ORDER TYPE		
MIGRATION	9094	87%
NEW INSTALL	359	3%
CHANGE	864	8%
MOVE	37	0%
RECORD	28	0%
SUSPEND	0	
RESTORE	0	
DEACTIVATION	27	0%
TOTAL	10409	100%

JULY

RE-REJECT ANALYSIS		
INITIAL	77.1%	8029
2X	20.9%	2174
3X OR >	2.0%	207
TOTAL	100%	10410

TOP ISSUES	ALL REJECTS			INITIAL			SUPPLEMENTAL		
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
1 NAME/ADDRESS	2832	27%	7.4%	2712	28.1%	7.1%	120	1.2%	0.3%
2 PON AGED OFF	1874	18%	4.9%	41	0.4%	0.1%	1833	17.6%	4.8%
3 MULTIPLE BTN	1542	15%	4.0%	1513	14.5%	4.0%	29	0.3%	0.1%
4 CLASS OF SERVICE (CID)	706	7%	1.8%	672	6.5%	1.8%	34	0.3%	0.1%
5 MIGRATION DECLINED	456	4%	1.2%	436	4.2%	1.1%	20	0.2%	0.1%
6 FEATURES/USOCS	445	4%	1.2%	343	3.3%	0.9%	102	1.0%	0.3%
7 PON/VERSION REJECTS	418	4%	1.1%	360	3.5%	0.9%	58	0.6%	0.2%
8 INVALID TN	389	4%	1.0%	373	3.6%	1.0%	16	0.2%	0.0%
9 LCON	342	3%	0.9%	340	3.3%	0.9%	2	0.0%	0.0%
10 REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	337	3%	0.9%	271	2.6%	0.7%	66	0.6%	0.2%

TOP 5 OF INITIAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
NAME/ADDRESS	2712	28%	7.1%
MULTIPLE BTN	1513	15%	4.0%
CLASS OF SERVICE (CID)	672	6%	1.8%
MIGRATION DECLINED	436	4%	1.1%
INVALID TN	373	4%	1.0%

TOP 5 OF SUPPLEMENTAL VERSIONS			
	REJECT VOLUME	% OF REJECTS	% OF ORDERS
PON AGED OFF	1833	18%	4.8%
NAME/ADDRESS	120	1%	0.3%
FEATURES/USOCS	102	1%	0.3%
REJECTS NEEDING RESEARCH	66	1%	0.2%
PON/VERSION REJECTS	58	1%	0.2%

TOP REJECT CODES

WCOM[Z23] name/address	18%	1910
R1645 - LSR/PON AGED OFF	18%	1874
G9496 - TNS=7704753071 ON LNUM=00002 NOT FOUND ON EATN=7704753071 FOR ACT=	15%	1517
WCOM[Z17] class of service	6%	652
G9626 - CLASS OF SERVICE LNPRL NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CONVERSION TO PORT/LOOP SERVICE	4%	402
G7905 - RSAG - INCORRECT COMMUNITY, INCORRECT ZIP CODE OR INVALID ADDRESS FORMAT	4%	396
G7250 - LSR HOUSENUMBER INCORRECT	4%	390
E2120 - LCON-NAME MUST BE UP TO 15 ALPHANUMERICS WITH EMBEDDED BLANKS AT MAIN LOCATION	3%	342
G8209 - USOC COMBINATION IS INVALID. FORMAT SAE 587 I1 ESXDC /TN 770 532-2155	3%	280
R1015 - PON DUPLICATE ON INITIAL LSR	2%	218
G7400 - CLEC DOES NOT OWN THIS ACCOUNT.	2%	201
G9860 - UNABLE TO HANDLE REQUEST; ENDUSER ACCOUNT FROZEN	2%	167
R1110 - D/TSENT MUST BE CURRENT DATE, OR A FUTURE DATE	1%	150
WCOM[Z12] pending order	1%	94
PD PENDING ORDER	1%	86
G7055 - NUM=7703939880 TELNO=7703939880 ACCOUNT IS FINAL	1%	86
D4045 - DLNUM=&DLNM LTN=<N ASSOCIATED LACT COMBINATION I OR O MISSING	1%	82
D4065 - DLNUM=&DLNM LTN=<N ASSOCIATED LACT COMBINATION I AND O IS MISSING	1%	82
WCOM[Z10] invalid or insufficient reject detail	1%	75
WCOM[Z18] supplement invalid	1%	75

ATTACHMENT 6

BellSouth Interconnection Services

1960 West Exchange Place
Suite 420
Tucker, Georgia 30084

October 1, 2001

Ms. Amanda Hill
Manager - Carrier Management
WorldCom
Two Northwinds Center
2520 Northwinds Parkway
Suite 500
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004

Dear Amanda:

This is in response to your e-mail dated August 28, 2001 to Kathy Ragsdale, requesting an investigation and written explanation regarding Purchase Order Numbers (PON) S004004221BSGAPR, S003868104BSGAPR and S003847727BSGAPR, which BellSouth returned to MCI Metro (MCI) for clarification and then issued and completed the service orders prior to receiving MCI's response to the clarification. Ms. Ragsdale requested that I respond to your request. Following are the results of BellSouth's investigation associated with each of MCI's questions:

MCI Question #1: Were these migration PONs completed, as stated by the version 2 clarification?

- a. If so, which version was completed by BellSouth ?
- b. Were both a FOC and completion notifier sent to MCI for each of these orders ?
- c. If not, why did the BST rep type the version 2 clarification, which indicated that the PON was completed on the initial version

BellSouth Response: The migration has been completed and the Customer Service Record (CSR) has been updated to reflect MCI as the local service provider. Following is the sequence of events for each individual PON:

S004004221BSGAPR – This PON was received electronically through BellSouth's Electronic Data Interchange (EDI). The system issued service orders NOC4BP80 and DOC30HJ9. Because the "D" order removed BellSouth's Voice Mail, the Local Exchange Service Order Generator (LESOG) placed both orders in an "error" status for manual review. In Georgia and

North Carolina, the "D" order requires a Field Identifier (FID) of ZLIG when the Call Forwarding feature is not being retained on the "N" service order.

The Mechanized Questionable Activity (QA) group reviews and clears errors of this type. Since the service order "dropped" for manual review, a service representative must review the entire order. If other errors are found, the PON will be returned to MCI for clarification. This was the case with this PON. The end user name on the PON was different from the name on the CSR (MCI CSR reflects LN of Nathaniel Edwards, LSR requested Robert Hudson with ERL Y). When the PON was returned for clarification, the service representative failed to cancel the pending orders that were issued by LESOG. When the ZLIG error was cleared, LESOG attempted to send a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) to MCI. The attempts failed because the LSR was in clarification. However, the service orders issued by LESOG processed and posted to the CSR. Due to the LSR being in a clarified status, the completion notification failed as well.

S003868104BSGAPR - PON had Call Forwarding feature. LESOG issued service orders NOC9NBR3 and DOC6WG10 and the system recognized that the ZLIG FID needed to be added and therefore, placed both orders in an error status. The service representative reviewed the order and the PON was returned for clarification because the EU page was incorrect with ERL of Y (MCI CSR reflects LN of Jamie Yarbrough, LSR requested Kristi Yarbrough). The service representative failed to cancel the pending LESOG orders.

The Mechanized QA group cleared ZLIG error, LESOG made multiple attempts to send a FOC and failed. The service orders processed, completed and posted to the CSR. Completion notice failed due to the LSR being held in a clarified status.

S003847727BSGAPR - PON had Call Forwarding feature. LESOG issued service orders NO5C5MG8 and DO55CM73 and the system recognized that the ZLIG FID needed to be added and therefore, placed both orders in an error status. The service representative reviewed the order and the PON was returned for clarification because the EU page was incorrect with ERL of Y (MCI CSR reflects LN of Phillip Woodside, LSR requested Phil Woodside). The service representative failed to cancel the pending LESOG orders.

The Mechanized QA group cleared ZLIG error, LESOG made multiple attempts to send FOC and failed. The service orders processed, completed and posted to the CSR. The completion notice failed due to the LSR being held in a clarified status.

MCI Question #2: The version 1 was returned to MCI with an automated notification "AO ASSIGNABLE ORDER" in addition to the clarification.

a. What does this automated response indicate?

BellSouth Response #2: "AO assignable Order" is message sent by BellSouth's electronic system acknowledging that a service order has been issued and is in a hold status for manual review.

The LCSC management has been requested to cover the service representatives of the correct procedures to use in situations as described above.

I trust that this information satisfies your concerns regarding this matter. Please feel free to call at me at 770-492-7543, if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Pamela D. Reynolds
Industrial Specialist

cc: Shannon Waters

ATTACHMENT 7

00001

1 BEFORE THE NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

2

IN THE MATTER OF:

3

4 APPLICATION OF BELL SOUTH TELECOMMUNICATION, INC.,

TO PROVIDE IN-REGION INTERLATA SERVICES PURSUANT

5 TO DOCKET NO. 9-55 SECTION 271 OF THE SUB1022

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

6

7

DEPOSITION OF

8

WILLIAM STACY

9

November 28th, 2001

10

9:00 a.m.

11

675 West Peachtree Street

12

Atlanta, Georgia

13

14

Elizabeth Gallo, CCR-B-1997

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00002

1

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL

2

3

On behalf of AT&T:

4

MICHAEL A. HOPKINS, Esquire

5

McKenna & Cuneo

6

1900 K Street, NW

7

Washington, DC 20006

8

9

On behalf of MCI WorldCom:

10

DULANEY L. O'ROARK, III, Esquire

11

KENNARD B. WOODS, Esquire

12

MCI Law & Public Policy

13

Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 3200

14

Atlanta, Georgia 30328

15

16

On behalf of BellSouth:

17

LISA FOSHEE, Attorney at Law

18

BellSouth Law Department

19

675 West Peachtree Street

20

Suite 4300

21

Atlanta, Georgia 30375

22

23

Also Present:

24

Ron Pate

10 Q. So there will be a --
 11 A. 10.0 and a 10.1.
 12 Q. We skipped --
 13 A. Excuse me, three, 10.0, 10.1,
 14 10.2. 10.0 is happening now.
 15 Q. So in your capacity in your job
 16 now, are you at all involved in the
 17 retirement of operational support systems that
 18 support CLEC operations?
 19 A. Yes, I am.
 20 Q. What is your role in that process?
 21 A. It is a two-step process. The
 22 way I characterize it, there is a strategic
 23 process.
 24 Q. Let me back up a second. I don't
 25 know if I used the right words. I think I
 00142 might have said retirement. What I mean is,
 1 the replacement of older systems with new
 2 systems rather than just cutting out an
 3 obsolete system all together?
 4 A. The answer is, yes, I'm also
 5 involved in that.
 6 MS. FOSHEE: I'm talking about
 7 retail systems or CLEC?
 8 MR. HOPKINS: I didn't break it
 9 down between retail and wholesale. I'm
 10 talking about systems I use to support CLECs.
 11 They may be purely wholesale.
 12 MS. FOSHEE: Includes BellSouth
 13 Legacy systems.
 14 MR. HOPKINS: It could involve
 15 BellSouth Legacy systems.
 16 THE WITNESS: Let me qualify my
 17 answer, then, to some extent. My primary
 18 involvement is when we are replacing one of
 19 the CLEC facing operational support systems,
 20 like EDI, TAG, LENS, and their components.
 21 That is my primary function, when
 22 we are considering replacement or retirement
 23 of those. It is a two-step process. There
 24 is a plan put together by the corporation
 00143 with input from me and other people that is
 1 a strategic plan that says here is a future
 2 state that we would like to arrive at where
 3 we have changed the components of our
 4 operational support systems in total, and here
 5 is where we would like to be in five years.
 6 Once I give my input to that
 7 plan, that is mostly done by the BellSouth IT
 8 community and the hardware and software
 9 architects who are looking out into the
 10 future and saying, what is the most desirable
 11 kind of software, what servers should we run
 12 it on, how is all that supposed to look two
 13 years, three years, five years from now?
 14 Then there are a series of what
 15 I generally call tactical decisions, which
 16 say, what are we going to do for the next 12
 17 months, 18 month. I'm heavily involved in
 18

19 those. One of those that is going on right
20 now is a decision about where does the next
21 piece of ordering functionality go and the
22 next piece of ordering functionality that was
23 sort of different was the Georgia order, I
24 believe in y'all's arbitration case, but I
25 may be remembering that wrong.

00144
1 That was brand new. Nobody had
2 ever done it before. We don't have anything
3 we could change to make it work that way.
4 It is a new effort. There is a strategic
5 and tactical decision to be made at that
6 point.
7 The strategic decision looking
8 toward the long-term plan says put it on what
9 we call the Telcordia platform. You have
10 seen those in our documents, the series of
11 things that start out with COG and DOM and
12 SOG.
13 We are using that right now to
14 produce XDSL orders and handle makeup
15 inquiries. Those were the first two functions
16 that got put up on that new strategic
17 platform. We decided, because of time and
18 budget constraints, we could not go there
19 with line splitting.
20 It is being done mostly on the
21 LESOG platform with Accenture doing the work.
22 The tactical decisions I have to make on a
23 month-to-month basis are, here is the strategy
24 the corporation has charged me to move to in
25 the long term. Here is how much funding I

00145
1 have this year, and here are two vendors,
2 different vendors saying I could accomplish
3 the work for different amounts of money and
4 time, which do I choose?
5 The time constraints on that
6 particular Georgia order, Telcordia could not
7 meet. Accenture could, so I gave it to that
8 corporation. But the long term direction
9 says move everything toward the Telcordia
10 platform. That is the strategy versus the
11 tactics side of it.
12 Q. (By Mr. Hopkins) When you say
13 you told them to go, is this your authority
14 to make?
15 A. There is a small group I consult
16 with. My boss obviously has the ultimate
17 authority for that. That is primarily my
18 charge.
19 Q. You're responsible, but she may
20 take your recommendation?
21 A. Right.
22 Q. What systems does that authority
23 run to?
24 A. The CLEC facing set of systems:
25 TAG, EDI, LENS, CSOTS, et cetera.

00146
1 Q. Then you said there is that

2 separate set of systems, the other systems.
3 A. What we referred to a minute ago,
4 the Legacy systems of the corporation --
5 SOCS, CRIS, ELMOS, WAFA -- things that are
6 used in common by BellSouth's retail unit and
7 the CLEC.
8 Q. Where would LEO and LESOG fit?
9 A. They are in mine.
10 Q. So you have CLEC-specific systems,
11 whether they are facing them directly or not?
12 A. Right.
13 Q. Are there any other tactical
14 movements other than line splitting?
15 A. Well, I mean that was the last
16 one. Literally every function that we are
17 ordered to do, we have to make those kinds
18 of decisions on. The other one that is in
19 that same January release is CSR parson. It
20 went the other way.
21 Accenture was not able to do most
22 of the work quickly enough. Telcordia wound
23 up with the jobs, so we are moving it
24 through the strategic platform now rather than
25 two years from now.

00147

1 Q. How do you access the CSRs?
2 Through TAG or LENS?
3 A. Behind the TAG, TAG talks to, in
4 this case, the system we call COG.
5 Q. It currently does?
6 A. Yes, for XDSL orders for today.
7 We are adding a new function between TAG and
8 COG and then between COG and DOM to parse
9 service requests and send it back.
10 From the user's standpoint --
11 well, parse CSR is a bad example because that
12 requires a lot of work on the CLEC side.
13 They have to accept new information coded
14 differently.
15 From the user's standpoint, it is
16 sort of a don't care what happens underneath
17 there if the data comes to you is the same.
18 Q. I don't know if this would be
19 tactical or a strategic decision, to move
20 from LEOLA SOG to the Telcordia platform?
21 A. That is clearly the strategic
22 direction. The decisions about when to do it
23 are tactical.
24 Q. Are there any plans in the next
25 18 months to begin that?

00148

1 A. In the sense that I told you a
2 minute ago, every time we add a function,
3 that decision is examined. The one that we
4 are trying to put on the table now to
5 discuss is that we have an implementation of
6 the ELMS-5 ordering map sitting out there per
7 the change control board in, I think, the
8 July, August, September time frame.
9 I don't remember exactly when it
10 was planned for. We will have to make a

20 that. They are business owners inside the
21 other units. If the business owner for ELMOS
22 were to propose a change, that would mean
23 that I was going to have to spend the money
24 rewrite all of CLEC pathy, as well as him.
25 He is who is the owner having to rewrite all
00151
1 of retail pathy.
2 Then I get input into that
3 decision. It is like the relationship we
4 have with the CLEC. If they are going
5 things that don't affect me, I don't get into
6 that part of the business.
7 Q. So you may ask them to do things
8 to help you?
9 A. Yes, in general. Most everything
10 we do requires some cooperation on their part
11 at least.
12 Q. So they support you in some
13 respects?
14 A. In some respects, yes.
15 Q. And then changes that they do may
16 impact your systems and you have to account
17 for those?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Are you aware of any changes in
20 those Legacy systems that have been discussed
21 that would impact the systems you are
22 responsible for?
23 A. There is only one that I'm aware
24 of. It is still at a very preliminary
25 stage. That is --
00152
1 MS. FOSHEE: Is this proprietary
2 information that we need to mark as
3 confidential?
4 THE WITNESS: It may be still.
5 It is considered confidential. I'm not sure
6 if it was shared outside the business.
7 Q. (By Mr. Hopkins) Let me see if
8 I could get to it. If you think this
9 information is confidential, tell me before
10 you answer or don't answer if you think it
11 is.
12 What OSS function is it related
13 to?
14 A. Repair.
15 MR. HOPKINS: That is my Navy
16 training. I don't want to deal with
17 confidential information because it is too
18 much of a pain to keep track with.
19 I'm going to take a minute to see
20 if I have anymore questions, but I think I'm
21 done.
22 (A recess was taken.)
23 MR. HOPKINS: I don't have anymore
24 questions, but if you want to tell me
25 anything you think I'm interesting in, I'll
00153
1 be happy to listen.
2 THE WITNESS: I don't think so.

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION
4 BY-MR.O'ROARK:
5 Q. Good afternoon. As you know, I'm
6 De O'Roark. It is good to see you again.
7 Towards the end of your discuss with Mr.
8 Hopkins, you talked about vendors that
9 BellSouth uses for certain systems. Has
10 BellSouth used outside vendors at least to
11 some extent to develop the OSS systems that
12 serve CLEC?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. Has BellSouth used vendors
15 exclusively for some of that work done
16 in-house?
17 A. Let's see. Going back in time, I
18 will not have the dates precise, BellSouth
19 had, prior to '96, its own IT department.
20 At some point during the '96-97-98 time
21 frame, that was outsourced.
22 Q. The entire IT function?
23 A. The entire IT function, and was
24 picked up by Accenture, then Anderson later
25 as they changed corporate structures.

00154
1 Accenture did -- let me back up. EDS got
2 the contract to manage the data center, take
3 care of the network and air conditioning and
4 that stuff, and Accenture/Anderson wanted the
5 contract to manage the code to do the
6 software work.
7 There was a small fragment of what
8 used to be
9 IT retained in BellSouth to manage the
10 projects.
11 Q. Anything that happened in '97-98?
12 A. To the best of my recollection, it
13 was between '96 and '97, but it was long
14 enough ago that I forgot which year it
15 happened. We have, of course, used other
16 vendors prior to that. Telcordia was a
17 vendor for some of the systems since prior to
18 the eighties.
19 Q. For BellSouth's Legacy systems?
20 A. Primarily, yes.
21 Q. Was the dichotomy that Telcordia
22 did a lot of the work on the Legacy systems
23 and Anderson/Accenture did most of the work
24 on the CLEC systems?
25 A. For a period of time, but that is

00155
1 not -- Anderson/Accenture has a tremendous
2 amount of work in the Legacy systems also.
3 It varies by systems. I will not have this
4 exactly correct, but for instance, CRIS, the
5 customer records inventory system, is almost
6 entirely an Accenture created and maintained
7 product.
8 On the other hand, one of the
9 maintenance systems, WAFA was, I believe,
10 originally written by Telcordia and any new
11 work on it is kind of split between Accenture

12 and Telcordia.

13 Q. Back in roughly '98 when BellSouth

14 outsourced most of its IT work, did the

15 BellSouth department go to Accenture?

16 A. Large portions of the BellSouth

17 people actually went to Accenture.

18 Q. Does Accenture run the EDI

19 ordering system that BellSouth provides the

20 CLEC?

21 A. Yes, they do.

22 Q. Is there a point person at

23 Accenture who handles that project?

24 A. There is, but I don't normally

25 work with them. As I said, we kept some of

00156

1 our internal resources who do the project

2 management, so my contact that would get to

3 that point is Linda Tate.

4 Q. That is a name I have heard

5 before. She was, I gather, in the BellSouth

6 IT department and remained with BellSouth

7 rather than going to Accenture?

8 A. Right. She was actually a project

9 manager supervisor or project manager rather

10 than a co-developer kind of person, and the

11 function we call project management we

12 retained inside BellSouth.

13 Q. Who created the EDI ordering

14 system? Was that done by the BellSouth's IT

15 department pre-Accenture?

16 A. Yes, BellSouth IT.

17 Q. Then Accenture took it over after

18 the IT department went to Accenture?

19 A. Yes. Well, I suppose the first

20 was in '97.

21 MS. FOSHEE: None of this is

22 confidential?

23 THE WITNESS: No. The original

24 work, when it was done in '97, would have

25 been done by BellSouth IT when we were

00157

1 working with AT&T to set up an EDI ordering

2 process.

3 Whenever the outsourcing happened,

4 it moved to Accenture.

5 Q. (By Mr. Hopkins) A CLEC, such as

6 MCI, that is using EDI for ordering and

7 wanting to get information to help the

8 systems run more smoothly or get information

9 for whatever reason, is initially going to go

10 through its account team at BellSouth?

11 A. It depends upon the information.

12 I suppose they would go through the account

13 team or if it was a production question, they

14 could go to the group we call EC support,

15 electronic communications support.

16 Q. Is EC support part of that IT

17 remanent or is that some other group?

18 A. It is another group. It actually

19 is part of Mr. Agerton's organization with

20 close ties to both the IT remanent and to

21 Accenture.
22 Q. Since most of the brain power that
23 created and to this day maintains the EDI
24 ordering system is now remanent and Accenture,
25 who today at BellSouth has a thorough
00158 understanding of how the EDI ordering systems
1 work? Is that what I call the IT remanent
2 or are there other folks at BellSouth who
3 know that?
4 A. No. It is the people in Linda
5 Tate's organization who actually are the
6 managers for that function and their Accenture
7 counterparts. It is a partnership. It is
8 not an either/or.
9 Q. Partnership between who?
10 A. Accenture and BellSouth.
11 Q. Meaning not literally in a legal
12 sense of a partnership, but they just work
13 together?
14 A. Right. The outsourcing contracts,
15 I have seen them, but they were designed to
16 ensure the parties work closely together.
17 Q. So if we, MCI, have production
18 questions and we go to EC support, I gather
19 that the EC support folks are probably going
20 to need to go to Linda Tate's group to get
21 specific EDI ordering information?
22 A. Well, it is more layers than that.
23 Q. Please explain.
24 A. EC support would be able to handle
00159 any of a number of routine problems, and let
1 me describe the EDI one. In LENS -- sorry,
2 let me do it the other way around. In LENS,
3 they deal with tens of requests a day where
4 the user has forgotten their password or
5 something wrong with their password.
6 Obviously, that is less typical in
7 EDI. There are cases in EDI when something
8 happened to the training partner ID where
9 they would have the knowledge and they would
10 respond.
11 If it gets deeper than that, they
12 would be going back through Linda Tate's
13 organization or directly to Accenture
14 depending upon what the problem was.
15 Q. Would that also be true for TAG
16 preordering?
17 A. No. For TAG preordering there are
18 two places. Again, EC support could answer
19 some of the questions. They would generally
20 then have to go to Telcordia depending upon
21 what. If it looked like a code problem,
22 they would have to go to Telcordia.
23 Q. Did Telcordia develop TAG for
24 BellSouth?
00160 A. Yes, they did.
1 Q. As opposed to the Accenture
2 situation where EDI was developed on BellSouth
3

13 my company and our Georgia launch. We are
14 talking about an LSR that is submitted for a
15 migration as specified using EDI for UNE-P.
16 A. Okay.
17 Q. I'm limiting the question to that
18 context.
19 When we, MCI, submit that LSR, the
20 first place it will go is to MCI's value
21 added network; is that your understanding?
22 A. That is my understanding of the
23 MCI connection. That is right.
24 Q. Then the next step is it goes
25 from R to VAN to the BellSouth VAN, which is
00163 Harbinger?
1 A.
2 A. Yes. That is my understanding
3 also.
4 Q. Let me stop right there. There
5 is another way a CLEC could submit an LSR.
6 That would be through direct connect; is that
7 right?
8 A. Connect direct.
9 Q. Connect direct?
10 A. It is the other way around.
11 Q. I gather that there are pros and
12 cons of whether you go connect direct or
13 through the VANS?
14 A. Yes. They are generally the
15 preference of the ordering company as to how
16 they prefer to do business, but there are, as
17 you said, pros and cons depending upon volume
18 and number of trading partners and lots of
19 other things.
20 Q. Can you summarize at a higher
21 lever what the benefits are to going connect
22 direct versus through a VAN?
23 A. At least from my understanding, a
24 VAN was set up primarily for occasional or
25 intermittent or low-volume connection
00164 requirements, and that we recommended connect
1 direct for high-volume continuing
2 relationships.
3 In other words, if you were only
4 going to send us 50 orders a month through
5 EDI, it was the right thing to do to set up
6 through a VAN who handled it on a per order
7 basis. If you send 50,000, the right
8 mechanism was connect direct is my
9 understanding.
10 Obviously, there are lots of
11 trade-offs all along that scheme.
12 Q. Getting back to the LSR flow, it
13 has gone from the MCI VAN to Harbinger.
14 Now, it goes to BellSouth. Was the entry
15 point at BellSouth is LEO?
16 A. No. Because we are talking EDI,
17 the entry point at BellSouth is an computer
18 called EDI central.
19 Q. What function does EDI central
20 perform?
21

22 A. It accepts EDI transactions on the
23 side that faces MCI in this case. The
24 function is called unwrap. It unwraps those
25 transactions and provides them, as you were

00165
1 about to say a moment ago, to LEO; so on the
2 MCI side of EDI central, you have an LSR,
3 but wrapped around it is the thing called an
4 EDI envelope.
5 Q. The ISA code?
6 A. No. ISA code is part of that
7 envelope. I was carrying this analogy too
8 far. The ISA code is kind of like the
9 return address.
10 Q. That identifies the envelope?
11 A. It identifies the envelope, but
12 all of the junk in the envelope is designed
13 to make sure that the LSR gets securely from
14 point A to point B.
15 Q. Does EDI central perform any
16 edits?
17 A. No. Other than unwrapping the
18 envelope -- let me correct that. Well,
19 sorry, it is not an edit. They have a duty
20 to return a transaction called a functional
21 acknowledgment, so in the sense they look at
22 the envelope and say, does this envelope meet
23 all of the EDI perimeters for correctness,
24 they do an edit, but it is a standard EDI
25 function that says is this a good envelope or

00166
1 not.
2 If it is a good envelope, I send
3 back a functional acknowledgment and say I
4 have got it. If the envelope is bad, if the
5 corner is torn off -- that is carrying the
6 analogy too far. If there are bites missing
7 at the end, if the thing does not match up,
8 it sends up a negative acknowledge. Bad
9 envelope, send it again.
10 Q. It does not edit the original LSRs
11 within that envelope?
12 A. No. It opens it up, unpacks it,
13 and sends it back to LEO.
14 Q. LEO, I gather, does do some edits?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Then LESOG, which we will talk
17 about in a moment, I'm sure does some more
18 edits?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. Can you tell me at the LEO stage
21 what edits are done and against what
22 databases?
23 A. Again, in very general terms, to
24 do this takes the ordering guide to walk
25 through all the edits that are done. In

00167
1 general, the edits are divided into two
2 groups. In LEO, the edit is called level-one
3 edits which are applied.
4 They have to do with, is there

00193

1 analysis in that study that was done. All
2 that has been communicated back to MCI. We
3 believe either a service rep is doing that or
4 there is a computer system glitch on the MCI
5 side that they are not transferring the
6 information properly -- I believe you are all
7 using TAG -- from TAG into the EDI system.
8 Q. Is there any point in the ordering
9 process where BellSouth bounces the address up
10 against the customer service record address?
11 A. Not to my knowledge.
12 Q. When the BellSouth rep takes an
13 LSR that has fallen out from manual
14 processing, are there any additional edit
15 checks or databases that the DON order
16 created by the rep who goes through, or is
17 editing against it outside what MCI would
18 normally experience?
19 A. No. Outside of what MCI would
20 normally experience, I can't think of any.
21 They use the same set of databases to
22 validate the order. Those are where our
23 primary data is contained.
24 Q. Your understanding is the D and N
25 order were submitted directly into sock and

00194

1 that there are no additional edits that are
2 applied?
3 A. Directly into sock from DOE, there
4 are no additional edits applied.
5 Q. Are there any system edits that
6 DOE imposes?
7 A. Like LESOG, DOE has a subset of
8 the SOCS edits that are a part of it. So
9 there are no additional edits, but there are
10 more applied when it gets to SOCS.
11 Q. Are the edits in DOE the same as
12 the edits in LESOG or are they different?
13 A. They are different subsets.
14 Q. Let's talk about design manual
15 fallout a little bit more. Is it your
16 understanding that when a BellSouth customer
17 had memory call, MCI wins the customer. The
18 customer migrated to BellSouth, but the LSR
19 in that case will automatically fall out to
20 manual processing?
21 A. No. My understanding is that it
22 does not. Although I was told this morning
23 we are chasing the defect in a code that
24 does indeed cause it to fall out in some
25 cases, it is not planned, not in the design

00195

1 of the system that that should fall out. In
2 fact, the design specifically states
3 otherwise.
4 We tested it and it worked. I
5 understand there has been a code, some code
6 defect detected in the last week or so that
7 indicates some of those orders do fall out
8 for manual handling, and they are getting

9 classified as BellSouth caused fallout
10 because the service rep is having to put some
11 character or FID on the order that is not
12 there.
13 Q. Is that the ZLIG FID?
14 A. Yes. I could not remember the
15 name.
16 Q. How about call-forwarding, we have
17 been told that if the BellSouth customer has
18 call-forwarding that LSR will fall out for
19 manual processing?
20 A. Designed to fall through, not fall
21 out. I'm not aware of an error in that
22 processing at the moment. Let me just chase
23 that one all the way to the other side at
24 the moment. The things that are designed to
25 fall out in your case at the moment are

00196

1 enhanced services.
2 So if the customer has voice mail,
3 the package we call enhanced voice mail,
4 instead of memory call, that is designed to
5 fall out because it is not available. So we
6 make a point of what do you want to do with
7 it. There are cases around the DSL service
8 where we have not settled these issues of,
9 are we going to provide BellSouth DSL service
10 on an NEP owned by MCI?
11 There are some of those cases that
12 fall out from manual handling. It is
13 enhanced services, not the basic service
14 packages.
15 Q. The two principle examples that
16 you are aware of are DSL and enhanced voice
17 mail?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. If somebody in BellSouth wanted to
20 figure out what was causing fallout, you
21 would have to go to Linda Tate's group or
22 Accenture?
23 A. Or actually to both. If we order
24 Accenture to do a study, it would go through
25 Linda Tate's group.

00197

1 Q. I gather it is your understanding
2 if the BellSouth customer has Complete Choice,
3 that is not supposed to fallout for manual
4 processing?
5 A. Other than with those exceptions.
6 You can have a voice mail as a part of
7 Complete Choice, although I'm not 100 percent
8 sure on that. I never looked at that
9 product specifically until we got into this
10 question about what happens, but in general,
11 the Complete Choice package consists of
12 switch-base features that are supposed to flow
13 through.
14 Q. The ZLIG FID has to be added to
15 the enhance services?
16 A. No. The ZLIG FID, as best as I
17 understand it right now, is what has to be

18 added to fix the memory call problem.
19 Q. How can a CLEC cause memory
20 fallout?
21 A. Well, if you are talking about the
22 whole category, the first manual fallout is
23 that they could place an order for something
24 that is not on the flow-through list.
25 Q. Let me narrow it to MCI, UNE-P,
00198 LSR.
1 A.
2 A. Place orders for those things that
3 are manual fallout. The two prime examples
4 are a customer that has DSL and one that has
5 voice mail.
6 Q. That would be a CLEC considered
7 fallout or CLEC caused fall out?
8 A. I don't know. I'm not sure on
9 that, on the flow-through report. I'm not
10 sure if that is classified as manual fallout
11 or CLEC caused fallout. I'm not clear which
12 bucket that is being put in.
13 They are both CLEC caused, but I
14 can't remember whether the edit for voice
15 mail is done early or late.
16 Q. Well, if the BellSouth customer
17 has enhanced voice mail, there is not any way
18 we would know that is true?
19 A. No, but you looked at their
20 customer service record and know they have
21 enhanced voice mail.
22 Q. Is there any way we could order
23 electronically and not have it fall to
24 manual?
25 A. Not in that particular case that I
00199 know of.
1 Q. So as I understand it, everything
2 in the CLEC caused fallout category will be
3 rejected. What you are describing is
4 something that is not going to be a reject?
5 A. No. This is a reject. We will
6 reject that order to you and say we can't
7 complete this order because this customer has
8 enhanced voice mail. I don't know what the
9 error code is, as I understand it.
10 Q. I think I understand what you just
11 said, but this is news to me.
12 A. Maybe I am misstating it. We
13 probably should put this to Mr. Pate, because
14 I read the discussion of it, but I was going
15 to your general question.
16 Q. Well, let me try one more run
17 just to make sure I understand what I think
18 you are telling me. If that were true, any
19 time we submitted an LSR, BellSouth customer
20 has enhanced voice mail, if that LSR is going
21 to be rejected, you are telling me there is
22 no way we could migrate that customer to MCI?
23 A. No, I'm not telling you that.
24 That customer has to make a choice about
00200

1 their enhanced voice mail. They would have
2 to disconnect it or you would have to provide
3 it differently. I don't know what the
4 choices are on an advanced service.
5 Q. Maybe it will help you to
6 understand that MCI is not offering enhanced
7 voice mail to its customers?
8 A. Right. That customer then would
9 have to make a choice about, as I understand
10 it, keeping their enhanced voice mail or
11 moving to MCI. It is my understanding that
12 they could not have both at the same time on
13 an UNE-P.
14 Q. Well, of course, we have told the
15 customer what services it is going to get,
16 and we are not offering enhanced voice mail.
17 By making a choice to go to MCI, the
18 customer is choosing not to have the voice
19 mail?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Why are you going to reject our
22 LSR?
23 A. The customer has not disconnected
24 their enhanced voice mail. Again, maybe that
25 is something we need to work out between the
00201 companies as far as an ordering scenario.
1 Q. What I understand you are saying
2 is the customer first needs to call
3 BellSouth, disconnect its enhanced voice mail,
4 and then MCI could submit the LSR and it
5 will go through, but not before?
6 A. That is the best I understand it.
7 Q. The same is true if the customer
8 has BellSouth DSL?
9 A. Yes. Although that is a policy
10 question that is being currently discussed
11 with MCI and AT&T both. I have not been in
12 those discussions for seven or eight weeks
13 about whether we will provide it and if so,
14 under what terms and conditions.
15 Q. Let's do a little comparison, Mr.
16 Stacy. For this you need to look at all
17 three exhibits, 11, 12 and 13. It is easy
18 to figure out which one is MCI in these
19 because of the numbers, but for Exhibit 11,
20 let me ask you to turn to page 3.
21 You might want to put a star next
22 to the 130. For Exhibit 12, the July
23 flow-through UNE report, I'll ask you to turn
24 to page 4 and put a star by 118.
25
00202
1 Then for Exhibit 13, please turn
2 to page 2
3 and focus on number 69. Let's focus
4 on the chief flow-through category for a
5 moment.
6 A. Just a second. Let me make sure
7 I have these or I could find the numbers.
8 Kay.
9 Q. You will see from June --

22 what time it is placed. If it is placed at
23 a time on Saturday, which intersects the time
24 when march is down for maintenance on Sunday,
25 it may not get a Sunday due date. It may

00226
1 get a Monday morning due date.
2 The due date calculator performs
3 that function.
4 Q. So essentially what I think you
5 are telling me the reason is, is that you
6 don't want BellSouth's system to be trying to
7 provision a UNE-P order on a day when it
8 can't be provisioned?
9 A. Right. We don't want to return a
10 firm order confirmation with an erroneous due
11 date on it, a day we know we cannot do it
12 on time.
13 Q. Does that mean, then, that the LSR
14 is going to be bumped up against the DSAP
15 database?
16 A. Yes, or a portion of it.
17 Q. Would that happen in LESOG or at
18 the SOCS stage?
19 A. It happens in LESOG.
20 Q. With respect to FOC timeliness, is
21 that measured when the FOC is generated in
22 LEO? FOC is generated in SOCS, isn't it?
23 A. Well, no.
24 Q. Let's start with this assumption.
25 A. Let me start at the beginning.

00227
1 The order comes through the door. Let's say
2 in your case it comes through EDI. At the
3 output of EDI central when that envelope has
4 been unwrapped, there is a unique LSR number.
5 There is a time stamp put on it.
6 That is the received time. That transaction
7 goes all the way down to SOCS, orders good,
8 status changes in SOCS. SOCS sends a
9 transaction back to LEO and says create an
10 FOC and send it back.
11 LEO creates the FOC and sends it.
12 That is time stamped out when EDI gets that
13 transaction.
14 Q. What do you mean by EDI?
15 A. EDI central, when they get that
16 transaction and put it in the envelope.
17 Georgia moved that as a result of the Georgia
18 order. It used to be at LEO. Now, it is at
19 EDI central.
20 Q. If we have that missing notifier
21 problem, about which MCI expressed concern, it
22 is generated in LEO but doesn't get to the
23 VAN, it is nevertheless time stamped for
24 measurement purposes?
25 A. Yes. It would have been time

00228
1 stamped. If it got from LEO to EDI central
2 and the problem is in EDI central, it would
3 have been time stamped there.
4 Q. Mr. Hopkins asked you about the

5 CAVE environment, I believe mostly relating to
6 the timing of when it was going to be taken
7 off the line?

8 I would like to understand a
9 little bit more about what the CAVE
10 environment is. My understanding is that the
11 CAVE environment is not a mirror image of
12 BellSouth's production environment; is that
13 accurate?

14 A. That is accurate and inaccurate.
15 Let me qualify that. It is a mirror image
16 of BellSouth's production environment, except
17 for the amount of hardware.

18 Q. What do you mean by that?

19 A. For instance, to handle the
20 volumes that we use in production on a
21 day-to-day basis, there are three TAG servers
22 with all of the customer volume spread over
23 the three of them. There is only one of
24 those in the CAVE environment, because the
25 CAVE environment is designed to handle the

00229 CLECs. It is not designed to handle
1 production volumes.
2 The software is all identical, but
3 the hardware configuration is smaller.

4 Q. When you say one of the three,
5 does that mean one of the three TAG servers
6 is used for CAVE?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Or is it entirely separate?

9 A. It is separately. CAVE is an
10 entirely separate copy of the production
11 system, except that it is smaller. It has
12 less capacity.

13 Q. How about for EDI, the same kind
14 of thing?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. One EDI server?

17 A. Well, EDI runs on a mainframe, but
18 there is a portion of the mainframe that is
19 dedicated to the CAVE environment. No
20 production orders flow through there. It is
21 just for CAVE.

22 Q. As you know, a CLEC that wants to
23 use CAVE can't just send a regular LSR into
24 the CAVE environment? I believe you have to
25 change the OCN?

00230 A. Right.

1 Q. So that it is clear that this is
2 a test LSR and not a real one?

3 A. Yes. The data sets. One of the
4 things you have to have in the test
5 environment is set of fictitious -- I'll use
6 that in the database sense -- a set of
7 fictitious accounts to order against. There
8 is a copy in CRIS. There is a copy of
9 certain CRIS accounts in CAVE.

10 They are not the real ones because
11 there is a test environment. One of the
12
13